UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/554,626	10/26/2005	Colin Brown	102790-133 (30077)	9217
	7590 04/14/200 AUGHLIN & MARCU	EXAMINER		
875 THIRD AV		MCKANE, ELIZABETH L		
18TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/14/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Occurrence	10/554,626	BROWN ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	ELIZABETH L. MCKANE	1797			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 De	ecember 2008				
<i>,</i> —	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
	pante quayre, 1000 0.21 1.1, 10	0 0.0.2.0.			
Disposition of Claims					
<ul> <li>4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 7 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 7 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>					
Application Papers					
<ul> <li>9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).</li> <li>11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.</li> </ul>					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal Pa 6)  Other:	te			

Art Unit: 1797

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kvietok et al. (US 2003/0175148).

Kvietok et al. teaches a dispensing device 20 which includes an electrically driven actuator device for dispensing a volatile material. The invention of Kvietok et al. further includes a refill 22 which includes a reservoir containing a volatile liquid and which further includes a closure means 74 or 102 on the refill. A switch means associated with the dispensing device is adapted to engage or interact with the closure means when the dispensing device is appropriately assembled. See paragraph [0079]. The actuator may be a heater or a fan (paragraph [0081]) and the switch means may incorporate an RFID tag. See paragraph [0083]. Although not specifically disclosed by Kvietok et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the RF transmission system of Kvietok et al. would have included an RF transmitter and receiver circuit and a metallic coil, as this is precisely what one would find in an inductively-coupled RF tag. Indeed, passive RFID tags by definition include a coiled antenna, which when exposed to radio waves from a reader will form a magnetic field.

Art Unit: 1797

The RFID tag draws power from the magnetic field, energizing the circuits in the tag thereby sending information encoded in the tag's memory. This type of RF tag is well-known in the art and would have been an obvious choice, if not inherent, in the invention of Kvietok et al..

## Response to Arguments

- 3. Applicant's arguments filed 11 December 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 4. On page 4 of the Response, Applicant argues that the conductive label and electric circuit of Kvietok et al. have nothing in common with the instant invention which is directed at controlling the authenticity of refills that may be associated with the main device. However, it is noted that the apparatus claims, require no such method and in fact, only recite a known type of RFID tag on the refill unit. As Kvietok et al. discloses the claimed RFID tag, these claims have been met. As to the method claim (claim 7), the only process step in the claim is "providing a dispensing device according to claim 1 to an ambient environment." Again, as use of the Kvietok et al. device necessarily includes "providing a dispensing device according to claim 1 to an ambient environment," the claim limitation has been met. Moreover, it is noted that the RFID device of Kvietok et al. is capable of being used in the manner intended by applicant.

Art Unit: 1797

## Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ELIZABETH L. MCKANE whose telephone number is (571)272-1275. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri; 5:30 a.m. - 2:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gladys Corcoran can be reached on 571-272-1214. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1797

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Elizabeth L McKane/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797

elm 9 April 2009